UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,962	02/10/2004	Blair Cooper	ID-912 (80236)	1603

7590 11/30/2005

CHRISTOPHER F. REGAN, ESQUIRE
ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST, P.A.
P.O. Box 3791
Orlando, FL 32802-3791

EXAMINER	
DALENCOURT, YVES	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/775,962	COOPER, BLAIR	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yves Dalencourt	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 September 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *09/19/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 09/06/2005.

Response to Amendment

The examiner has acknowledged the amended claims 1, 7, 11, and the Terminal Disclaimer.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 09/06/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument (page 10, second paragraph), the examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's assertion because Binding et al does disclose the claimed limitations by sending a Get request to a first universal resource locator (URL) "XYZ", and responding to the work jobs from the application server through a second universal resource locator (URL) "abc" (see col. 8, line 67 through col. 9, line 5; col. 10, lines 46 – 49). Binding discloses that the client issues an HTTP GET request 310, which contains the URL " xyz". The server checks to determine if supplemental information is needed to process the client request. If so, a redirect message is sent to the client (claimed accepting work jobs from the application server). This redirect response contains a redirected URL shown in the example as the URL "abc ", and a request header identifying the supplemental information that the server is requesting from the client. Thus, Binding sends back the requested supplemental

information (such as work jobs, or tasks) to the server as requested in a different universal resource locator (URL)

Applicant should duly note that Binding's system is not only redirected the job request to the server, but it is also received a response with respect to the job request using a second URL different from the first URL. Such system of Binding has the structural and functionality limitations of performing the use of sending GET request to the server using a first URL and providing a response from the server by sending a POST request with the result for the above mentioned request using a URL different from the first URL. Moreover, Applicant kindly submitted (on page 10, lines 17 – 18) that the POST request is well known in the computer network environment to use by a server to provide job results back to a client. Thus, Applicant's assertion with respect to the abovementioned limitation is moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Binding et al (US 6,775,687; hereinafter Binding) in view of O'Donnell et al (US 2004/0117615).

Regarding claim 1, Binding teaches a communications system (fig. 3B) comprising an application server (item 305, fig. 3B) and at least one communications device for processing requests from one another (item 300, fig. 3B), said at least one communications device processing requests using a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) client application (col. 7, lines 10 - 20); and an HTTP server for interfacing said HTTP client application with said application server (col. 7, lines 34 - 36); said HTTP server and said HTTP client application formatting requests to be communicated therebetween via the Internet an HTTP format (col. 7, lines 10 - 20), and each providing additional state information with the HTTP formatted requests recognizable by the other for authenticating the application server and said HTTP client application to one another (col. 7, lines 36 – 53; col. 7, line 54 through col. 8, line 23); said HTTP client application accepting work jobs from said application server by sending a Get request to a first universal resource location (URL) associated with said HTTP server (310, fig. 3C; col.8, lines 58 - 67), and responding to the work jobs from said application server by sending a Post request with results for the work jobs to a second URL different from the first URL and also associated with said HTTP server (312, fig. 3C; col. 8, line 67 through col. 9, line 5; col. 10, lines 46 - 49).

Binding teaches substantially all the limitations, except for the limitations of a plurality of communications devices having a plurality of user accounts associated therewith, and application server for accessing the user accounts via the HTTP client application.

However, O'Donnell teaches, in an analogous art, an access site that allows a client application to access a server application on behalf of a subscriber who has an account at the client site (see paragraphs [0017], [0023], and [0033] – [0034].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify US Application No. 10/775,674 by incorporating the idea of a plurality of communications devices having a plurality of user accounts associated therewith, and application server for accessing the user accounts via the HTTP client application as evidenced by O'Donnell for the purpose of improving on the ability of subscribers to grant access rights, particularly in environments where client applications request server applications to process subscriber data on behalf of subscribers.

Regarding claim 2, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Binding further teaches that the additional state information comprises a global unique identifier (GUID) associated with said HTTP client application (col. 9, lines 3 – 5; col. 9, lines 30 – 38; col. 11, lines 9 – 13; Binding discloses that additional supplemental information is needed from the client, and a request header identifying the supplemental information needed).

Regarding claim 3, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 1, but fail to specifically teach that the user accounts comprise email accounts. However, **Official Notice** is taken by the examiner that the limitation of the user accounts comprise email accounts is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the teachings of Binding and O'Donnell by incorporating an email account for the purpose of managing efficiently emails sent or received.

Regarding claim 4, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Binding further teaches that said HTTP client application and said HTTP server further provide sequencing information with the HTTP formatted requests (col. 10, lines 1 - 21).

Regarding claim 5, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Binding further teaches the communications system of claim 1 wherein said HTTP client application and said HTTP server format the additional state information as HTTP headers for respective HTTP formatted requests (col. 8, lines 41 - 44).

Regarding claim 6, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 1, and Binding further teaches the communications system of claim 1 wherein said at least one communications device is within a protected computing environment (col. 8, lines 6 – 23; Binding discloses that suppose that a server, responding to a client's initial request for content protected with access controls, sends a REDIRECT message to the client with a request header asking for the client's password).

Regarding claim 7, Binding teaches a communications system comprising (fig. 3B) an application server (item 305, fig. 3B) and at least one communications device for processing requests from one another (item 300, fig. 3B), said at least one communications device processing requests using a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) client application (col. 7, lines 10 - 20); and an HTTP server for interfacing said HTTP client application with said application server (col. 7, lines 34 - 36); said HTTP server and said HTTP client application formatting requests to be communicated therebetween

via the Internet in an HTTP format (col. 7, lines 10 – 20), and each providing a global unique identifier (GUID) associated with said HTTP client application with the HTTP formatted requests for authenticating the application server and said HTTP client application to one another (col. 7, lines 36 – 53; col. 7, line 54 through col. 8, line 23; col. 9, lines 3 – 5); said HTTP client application accepting work jobs from said application server by sending a Get request to a first universal resource locator (URL) from said HTTP server (310, fig. 3C; col.8, lines 58 - 67), and responding to the work jobs from said application server by sending a Post request with results for the work jobs to a second URL different from the first URL and also associated with said HTTP server, and said HTTP client application and said HTTP server further providing sequencing information with the HTTP formatted requests (312, fig. 3C; col. 8, line 41 through col. 9, line 5; col. 10, lines 46 - 49).

Binding teaches substantially all the limitations, except for the limitations of a plurality of communications devices having a plurality of user accounts associated therewith, and application server for accessing the user accounts via the HTTP client application.

However, O'Donnell teaches, in an analogous art, an access site that allows a client application to access a server application on behalf of a subscriber who has an account at the client site (see paragraphs [0017], [0023], and [0033] – [0034].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify US Application No. 10/775,674 by incorporating the idea of a plurality of communications devices having a plurality of user accounts associated

therewith, and application server for accessing the user accounts via the HTTP client application as evidenced by O'Donnell for the purpose of improving on the ability of subscribers to grant access rights, particularly in environments where client applications request server applications to process subscriber data on behalf of subscribers.

Regarding claim 8, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 7, but fail to specifically teach that the user accounts comprise email accounts. However, **Official Notice** is taken by the examiner that the limitation of the user accounts comprise email accounts is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Binding and O'Donnell by incorporating an email account for the purpose of managing efficiently emails sent or received.

Regarding claim 9, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 7, and Binding further teaches the communications system of claim 7 wherein said HTTP client application and said HTTP server format the additional state information as HTTP headers for respective HTTP formatted requests (col. 8, lines 41 - 44).

Regarding claim 10, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 7, and Binding further teaches the communications system of claim 7 wherein said at least one communications device is within a protected computing environment (col. 8, lines 6 – 23; Binding discloses that suppose that a server, responding to a client's initial request for content protected with access controls, sends a REDIRECT message to the client with a request header asking for the client's password).

Regarding claim 11, Binding teaches a method for exchanging supplemental information (fig. 3B) comprises a plurality of communications device (item 300, fig. 3B) using an application server (item 305, fig. 3B), the communications devices being connected together in a network, and at least one of the communications devices processing requests using a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) client application associated therewith (col. 7, lines 10 - 20), the method comprising interfacing the application server with the HTTP client application using an HTTP server (col. 7, lines 34 - 36), the HTTP server and the HTTP client application formatting requests to be communicated therebetween in an HTTP format via the Internet (col. 7, lines 10 - 20), and each providing additional state information with the HTTP formatted requests recognizable by the other for authenticating the application server and the HTTP client application to one another (col. 7, lines 36 – 53; col. 7, line 54 through col. 8, line 23; col. 9, lines 3 – 5); and using the HTTP client application to accept work requests from the application server by sending a GET request to a first universal resource locator (URL) associated with the HTTP server (310, fig. 3C; col.8, lines 58 - 67), and to respond to the work jobs from the application server by sending a POST request with results for the work jobs to a second URL different from the first URL and also associated with the HTTP server (312, fig. 3C; col. 8, line 67 through col. 9, line 5; col. 10, lines 46 - 49).

Binding teaches substantially all the limitations, except for the limitation of accessing a plurality of user accounts associated with a plurality of communications device using an application server.

However, O'Donnell teaches, in an analogous art, an access site that allows a client application to access a server application on behalf of a subscriber who has an account at the client site (see paragraphs [0017], [0023], and [0033] – [0034].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify US Application No. 10/775,674 by incorporating the idea of accessing a plurality of user accounts associated with a plurality of communications device using an application server as evidenced by O'Donnell for the purpose of improving on the ability of subscribers to grant access rights, particularly in environments where client applications request server applications to process subscriber data on behalf of subscribers.

Regarding claim 12, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 11, and Binding further teaches that the additional state information comprises a global unique identifier (GUID) associated with the HTTP client application (col. 9, lines 3 – 5; col. 9, lines 30 – 38; col. 11, lines 9 – 13; Binding discloses that additional supplemental information is needed from the client, and a request header identifying the supplemental information needed).

Regarding claim 13, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 11, but fail to specifically teach that the user accounts comprise email accounts. However, **Official Notice** is taken by the examiner that the limitation of the user accounts comprise email accounts is old and well known in the art. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

the teachings of Binding and O'Donnell by incorporating an email account for the purpose of managing efficiently emails sent or received.

Regarding claim 14, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 11, and Binding further teaches that the HTTP client application and the HTTP server further provide sequencing information with the HTTP formatted requests (col. 10, lines 1 - 21).

Regarding claim 15, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 11, and Binding further teaches that the HTTP client application and the HTTP server format the additional state information as HTTP headers for respective HTTP formatted requests (col. 8, lines 41 - 44).

Regarding claim 16, Binding and O'Donnell teach all the limitations in claim 11, and Binding further teaches that the at least one communications device is within a protected computing environment (col. 8, lines 6 – 23; Binding discloses that suppose that a server, responding to a client's initial request for content protected with access controls, sends a REDIRECT message to the client with a request header asking for the client's password).

Conclusion.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yves Dalencourt whose telephone number is (571) 272-3998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 7:30AM - 6: 00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yves Dalencourt
Y.D
November 22, 2005

ARIO ETIENNE
PRIMARY EXAMINER